UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,098	10/29/2003	David J. Lineman	5670-29	6619

7590   06/21/2007

Robert W. Glatz
Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec, P.A.
P.O. Box 37428
Raleigh, NC 27627

EXAMINER
WEINTROP, ADAM S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2145	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/21/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/696,098	LINEMAN, DAVID J.
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Adam S. Weintrop	2145	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 October 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>29 October 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/7/05</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1.   **Claims 1-25** are objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding **claim 1**, the phrase "a wireless or wired protocol" on claim line 12 has already been defined and should be replaced with --the wireless or wired protocol-- to improve the clarity of the claim.

Regarding **claim 3**, the term "a responsive query" in claim line 1 has already been defined and should be replaced with --the responsive query-- to improve the clarity of the claim. The term "a wireless protocol request" on claim line 4 has already been defined and should be replaced with --the wireless protocol request-- to improve the clarity of the claim. The term "a wired protocol request" on claim line 5 has already been defined and should be replaced with --the wired protocol request-- to improve the clarity of the claim.

Regarding **claims 7, 12, and 19**, the term "a text query" the second time on claim line 2 should be replaced with --another text query-- to improve the clarity of the claim language.

Regarding **claim 9**, the term "a wireless or wired protocol request" on claim lines 4-5 has already been defined and should be replaced with --the wireless or wired protocol request-- to improve the clarity of the claim.

Regarding **claim 13**, the term "a user" on claim lines 5, 6, 7, and 8 have already been defined and should be replaced with --the user--. The term "a responsive query--

on claim line 7 has already been defined and should be replaced with --the responsive

query--. The term "a challenge question" on claim line 7 has already been defined and

should be replaced with --the challenge question--. The term "received user access

requests" on claim line 9 is plural and should be replaced with --received user access

request-- to improve the clarity of the claim.

Regarding **claim 25**, the phrase "a wireless or wired protocol" on claim line 17

has already been defined and should be replaced with --the wireless or wired protocol--

to improve the clarity of the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   **Claims 1-8, 12-20, and 25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Bansal et al. (US 2003/0120593).

Regarding **claim 1**, Bansal et al. anticipates:

A multi-protocol network password and/or account privileges management self-service application access method comprising:

receiving a user access request from a user at a server associated with the network password and/or account privileges management self-service application (section 0423, where a user can subscribe to content, seen as account privileges management);

determining whether a protocol of the received request is a wireless or wired protocol (section 0167-0168, where HTTP or WAP can access the system, seen as wired and wireless protocols);

formatting the received request to a common format for processing by the self-service application (section 0009-0011, where conversions are made from system formats to target communications protocols); and

selectively transmitting a responsive query including a challenge question to validate the user access request from the self-service application to the user based on the wireless protocol when the received request is a wireless protocol request and based on the wired protocol when the received request is a wired protocol request based on whether the received request is determined to be a wireless or wired protocol (section 0009-0016, where conversions are made from system formats to target communications protocols in both directions, with protocols being wired and wireless as they are HTTP or WAP, and section 0424, where a response can include a confirmation request, seen as a challenge

question since the user is required to act upon the request to confirm the user's

identity).

Regarding **claim 3**, Bansal et al. anticipates:

The method of Claim 1 wherein transmitting a responsive query comprises:

formatting the responsive query based on the wireless protocol when the

received request is a wireless protocol request and based on the wired protocol

when the received request is a wired protocol request; and

transmitting the formatted responsive query (section 0009-0016, where

conversions are made from system formats to target communications protocols

in both directions, and protocols are HTTP and WAP, seen as wired or wireless).

Regarding **claims 4 and 16**, Bansal et al. anticipates:

The method of Claim 3 or the system of claim 15, wherein the wireless protocol

comprises a

wireless access protocol (WAP) and wherein the wired protocol comprises a

Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) (section 0009-0016, where conversions are

made from system formats to target communications protocols in both directions,

and protocols are HTTP and WAP, seen as wired or wireless).

Regarding **claims 5 and 17,** Bansal et al. anticipates:

The method of Claim 4 or the system of claim 16 wherein the wireless access protocol uses wireless mark-up language (WML) and wherein the wired protocol uses hypertext mark-up language (HTML) (section 0009-0016, where communications protocols are HTTP and WAP, seen as wired or wireless, and they use HTML and WML, respectively).

Regarding **claim 6**, Bansal et al. anticipates:

The method of Claim 3 wherein the common format comprises a data format of the self-service application and wherein formatting the responsive query includes receiving the responsive query from the self-service application in the data format of the self-service application (section 0007-0011, where conversions between system based application formats and a user protocol are performed, seen as formatting queries from the system format to user's protocol).

Regarding **claims 7, 12, and 19**, Bansal et al. anticipates:

The method of Claim 6, Claim 1, or the system of claim 18, wherein the formatted responsive query comprises a text query and the user access request comprises a text query (section 0014-0016, where interactions with the server consists of text interactions).

Regarding **claims 8 and 20**, Bansal et al. anticipates:

The method of Claim 7 or the system of claim 18, wherein the user access

request comprises a

user identifier and wherein the responsive query comprises a challenge question

selected based on the user identifier to validate the user access request

(sections 0422-0424, where the request for subscription services comprises a

user identifier, seen as the email address, and the confirmation responsive query

is the message issued that must be responded too, which is sent to the email

address of the requester, seen as being based from the user identifier).

Regarding **claim 13**, Bansal et al. anticipates:

A multi-protocol network password and/or account privileges management self-

service application access system comprising:

a wireless protocol communication interface configured to receive a user access

request from a user and transmit a responsive query including a challenge

question to validate the user access request to a user using a wireless protocol

(section 0423, where a user can subscribe to content, seen as account privileges

management and a request, and section 0009-0016, where conversions are

made from system formats to target communications protocols in both directions,

with protocols being wired and wireless as they are HTTP or WAP, and section

0424, where a response can include a confirmation request, seen as a challenge

question since the user is required to act upon the request to confirm the user's

identity);

a wired protocol communication interface configured to receive a user access

request from a user and transmit a responsive query including a challenge

question to validate the user access request to a user using a wired protocol

(section 0423, where a user can subscribe to content, seen as account privileges

management and a request, and section 0009-0016, where conversions are

made from system formats to target communications protocols in both directions,

with protocols being wired and wireless as they are HTTP or WAP, and section

0424, where a response can include a confirmation request, seen as a challenge

question since the user is required to act upon the request to confirm the user's

identity); and

a conversion circuit configure to format the received user access requests to a

common format for processing by the network password and/or account

privileges management self-service application (section 0009-0011, where

conversions are made from system formats to target communications protocols).

Regarding **claim 15**, Bansal et al. anticipates:

The system of Claim 13 wherein the conversion circuit is further configured to

format the responsive query based on the wireless protocol when the received

request is a wireless protocol request and based on the wired protocol when the

received request is a wired protocol request (section 0009-0016, where

conversions are made from system formats to target communications protocols

in both directions, and protocols are HTTP and WAP, seen as wired or wireless).

Regarding **claim 18**, Bansal et al. anticipates:

The system of Claim 15 wherein the common format comprises a data format of the self-service application and wherein the conversion circuit is further configured to receive the responsive query from the self-service application in the data format of the self-service application (section 0007-0011, where conversions between system based application formats and a user protocol are performed, seen as formatting queries from the system format to user's protocol).

Regarding **claim 25**, Bansal et al. anticipates:

A computer program product for accessing a multi-protocol network password and/or account privileges management self-service application, the computer program product comprising:

a computer-readable storage medium having computer-readable program code embodied in said medium, said computer-readable program code comprising (section 1008, with a combination of computer software and hardware being able to run the system):

computer-readable program code that receives a user access request from a user at a server associated with the network password and/or account privileges management self-service application (section 0423, where a user can subscribe to content, seen as account privileges management);

computer-readable program code that determines whether a protocol of the

received request is a wireless or wired protocol (section 0167-0168, where HTTP

or WAP can access the system, seen as wired and wireless protocols);

computer-readable program code that formats the received request to a common

format for processing by the self-service application (section 0009-0011, where

conversions are made from system formats to target communications protocols);

and

computer-readable program code that selectively transmits a responsive query

including a challenge question to validate the user access request from the self-

service application to the user based on the wireless protocol when the received

request is a wireless protocol request and based on the wired protocol when the

received request is a wired protocol request based on whether the received

request is determined to be a wireless or wired protocol (section 0009-0016,

where conversions are made from system formats to target communications

protocols in both directions, with protocols being wired and wireless as they are

HTTP or WAP, and section 0424, where a response can include a confirmation

request, seen as a challenge question since the user is required to act upon the

request to confirm the user's identity).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   **Claims 9-10 and 21-23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Bansal et al. (US 2003/0120593) in view of O'Connell (US

5,991,882).

Regarding **claim 9**, Bansal et al. teaches:

The method of Claim 8 wherein the method further comprises:

determining whether the received response to the challenge question is a

wireless or wired protocol request (section 0167-0168, where HTTP or WAP can

access the system, seen as wired and wireless protocols);

formatting the received response to the challenge question to the common format

for processing by the self-service application (section 0007-0011, where

conversions between system based application formats and a user protocol are

performed, seen as formatting queries from the system format to user's protocol).

However, Bansal et al. does not teach:

Receiving a response to the challenge question from the user at the server

associated with the self-service application; and

Transmitting a confirmation of execution of the received self-service request to

the user if the user access request is validated.

The general concept of receiving a response from a challenge question and then transmitting a confirmation of execution if the user access request is valid is well known in the art as illustrated by O'Connell. O'Connell teaches a password resetting system where a challenge question is prompted to the user if a password reset is desired, and then the password is reset if the answer is validated (column 1, lines 48-53, where confirmation of execution is seen as the actual password reset and a stored question is seen as the challenge question). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Bansal et al. with using challenge questions and validations as taught by O'Connell in order to automate a password change as noted in O'Connell's disclosure in column 1, lines 20-37.

Regarding **claim 10**, Bansal et al. and O'Connell teach all of the limitations as described above, with Bansal et al. further teaching:

The method of Claim 9 further comprising the following carried out by the self-service application:

receiving the user access request in the common format (section 0422-0423, where the user access request is performed and section 0008-0011, where outside protocols are converted to the system based format during transactions); and receiving the received response to the challenge question in the common format (section 0424, where responses to the confirmation request is required

and section 0008-0011, where outside protocols are converted to the system

based format during transactions).

Bansal et al. does not teach:

Selecting the responsive query based on the user identifier;

determining if the user access request is valid based on the received response to

the challenge question; and

servicing the user access request only if the user access request is valid.

The general concept of selecting the responsive query based on the user

identifier, validating the challenge question's answer, and then servicing the

request upon a valid answer is well known in the art as illustrated by O'Connell.

O'Connell teaches selecting a responsive query based on the user identifier

(column 6, lines 40-45), and validating a challenge question's answer and

servicing the access once validated (column 1, lines 51-53). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Bansal

et al. with using challenge questions and validations based on user identifiers as

taught by O'Connell in order to automate a password change as noted in

O'Connell's disclosure in column 1, lines 20-37.

Regarding **claims 21-23**, Bansal et al. teaches:

The system of Claim 20 wherein the conversion circuit is configured to format a

received response to the challenge question in the wireless protocol or the wired

protocol to the common format for processing by the self-service application

(section 0424, where responses to the confirmation request is required and section 0008-0011, where outside protocols are converted to the system based format during transactions).

Bansal et al. does not teach:

Wherein the system further comprises a validation circuit that determines if the user access request is valid based on the formatted received response to the challenge question and the system further comprising a service circuit that services the user access request only if the user access request is valid, as required by claim 22, or wherein the validation circuit and the service circuit comprise the self-service application as required by claim 23.

The general concept of validating a challenge question's answer and then servicing the request and also having a service and validation circuit comprise a self-service application are well known in the art as illustrated by O'Connell. O'Connell teaches that challenge questions are issued to the users and their answers are validated and then services based on the correct answer (column 1, lines 51-53). O'Connell also teaches the system is automated (column 1, lines 45-54, where the system is self-service since it is automated, and it validates and services). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Bansal et al. with using challenge questions and validations and combining the two functions in a self-service application as taught by O'Connell in order to automate a password change as noted in O'Connell's disclosure in column 1, lines 20-37.

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

"An Introduction to Identity Management" (Lee) describes self-service applications for password and identity management.

"Bringing the Wireless Internet to Mobile Devices" (Saha et al.) describes mobile WAP protocol conversion through WAP gateways.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam S. Weintrop whose telephone number is 571-270-1604. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on 571-272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AW 6/13/07

JASON CARDONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER